

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/665,036	ILIC ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia Leith	1655	

All Participants:

(1) Patricia Leith.

(2) Andrew Lawrence.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 December 2005
Time: approx. 3pm EST
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

none

Prior art documents discussed:

Mudd et al. (US 4,745,186)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The species of apple was found allowable and therefore the Examiner performed a detailed search of the species of tomato with regard to the claimed invention. It was relayed to Mr. Lawrence that Mudd et al. (US 4,745,186) taught the epicuticular extraction of acylhexoses from *Lycopersicon pennellii* (wild tomato) (see Abstract for example). In light of this reference Mr. Lawrence agreed to the cancellation of the species of tomato in the claims. .